

The Lessons of The Oneida Community for Today:

Philosophical and Religious Foundations

Tonight, for the first time in history, descendants of what has been called «the most intense and comprehensive experiment in human behaviour ever made» are meeting together with scholars and other interested persons to begin the process of evaluating together the meaning of the experience of The Oneida Community.¹ This initiative of the Woodrow Wilson Center, whose function it is to guard the intellectual heritage of the United States, adds a new page to the history of the «Washington Connection» between this city and people associated with the utopian community at Oneida.²

The father of John Humphrey Noyes, the founder of The Oneida Community, was a member of the House of Representatives for the state of Vermont from 1815-1817. Most likely it was through this channel that the Noyes family heard Robert Owen's speech given in 1825 before both houses of Congress, the Supreme Court judges, President James Monroe, and President-elect John Quincy Adams.³ Owen, the founder of the New Harmony Society in Indiana, electrified the nation with his plans to construct a perfect society dedicated to the eradication of egotism and directed toward the common good. Owen stated:

My desire is, to introduce to these States, and through them, to the world at large, a new social system . . . fully adequate to effect the most important improvements throughout society The new system forms man into a rational being.⁴

We are told that «Noyes himself, though only a boy of thirteen, could in later years vividly recall the thrill of an impending social millennium which shot through the American nation.»⁵

Owen's New Harmony Society brought together nine hundred men, women, and children for a period of two and one-half years. His society, based on purely rational principles, failed according to Owen because of basic weaknesses in human nature. Noyes determined to build a perfect society himself not on purely rational grounds, but also on the foundation of faith in God. For Noyes, perfection demanded the complementary interaction of faith and reason. God, he said, was the «backbone» of all human progress.⁶

In trying to evaluate the contemporary lessons of The Oneida Community it is important to examine its successes as well as its failures, for we learn as much from both sorts of eventualities. The Oneida Community spanned an early period of formation in Putney, Vermont from 1835-1847, a middle period of growth and stability in Oneida, New York and Wallingford, Connecticut from 1848-1876, and a period of disintegration in which members spread from Oneida to Niagara Falls, Canada and Orange County, California from 1877-1881.⁷ What were the philosophical and religious principles which held together three hundred people for nearly thirty years?

A most fundamental principle of The Oneida Community was to combine what Noyes called «the contemplation of the monk with the pragmatic acumen of the engineer.»⁸ Indeed, it was this brilliant synthesis of contemplation and action that produced four concrete legacies of the Community which are still with us today: (1) the significant industry known as Oneida Ltd.; (2) the Mansion House which serves as the focus of life for descendants of the Community; (3) the approximately sixteen hundred newspapers and journals which have recently entered the public domain through the cataloguing of Syracuse University and (4) the living genetic structure which every direct

descendent carries in the cells of his or her body. Each of these legacies will now be considered in turn.

From the beginning, the members of The Oneida Community released their creativity at work into highly inventive and technological areas. The Community recognized that the gifts of the intellect and will were best used to move humanity forward -- not backward. Therefore, they chose to be in advance of their times in the best tradition of the American spirit which endeavors always to shape the future rather than remain content with the past. At the same time, the Community also held onto the central importance of Christian values in the marketplace. This was accomplished through an insistence on manufacturing the best quality of product in their traps, travel bags, silk thread, or silverware.⁹ It also led to a policy of complete honesty in advertising and selling of Community products. This double principle of progress and value has obvious applications in today's marketplace.¹⁰

The principle of constructing a common building in order to facilitate a common life was first articulated by Noyes in 1849 when he objected to the practice of living in separate houses in a utopian community. Noyes said: «A congeries of loose particles cannot make a living body.»¹¹ The Mansion House served as a means of forging a common identity among members of The Oneida Community. In fact, it still functions today as the most concrete way that descendants of the Community continue to renew their common identity. This same principle is practiced in such diverse places as the construction of community centers in the planned city of Columbia, Maryland or in the construction of the Nova Huta Cathedral in Poland. Stated simply: a building

which is experienced as belonging to a community of persons serves to stabilize and regenerate that sense of being a «living body».

The next successful legacy, or the vast volume of written material produced by the Community sprang from a love of learning and of the written word. This love, when joined to a desire to transform the world through the use of the media available at the time, produced an astonishing richness of writings that has only begun to be analyzed. The members of The Oneida Community delighted in interacting with the ideas of the rest of the world. Art, history, mathematics, political theory, literature, languages, and science were avidly studied. Newspapers and letters were regularly read aloud in public meetings. Visitors to the Community abounded. Salesmen were sent across the land to sell Oneida products. All of this activity produced a constant cross-fertilization of ideas between the outside world and the utopian community. Noyes did not want this community to withdraw from society; he believed that the world was fundamentally good. He called the ability «to turn around and claim the undivided whole as our inheritance, and insist that it is all good» the philosopher's stone of community life.¹² This attitude of the love of the world as fundamentally good is an impetus for today for the effort to engage in active transformation of the world. The counter direction, or a belief that the world is bad, leads to apathy and withdrawal. Oneida's philosopher's stone then is an important contribution to American life.

The next concrete legacy which many of us who are descendents of The Oneida Community carry with us is our genetic structure. The influence of Darwin's theories of evolution, joined to the religiously motivated

desire to overcome natural selection preference of romantic love forged the stirpiculture experiments of the latter years of the Community. In addition, if acquired characteristics can be inherited in any way, then all descendents of The Oneida Community carry traces of a genetic programming which reaches towards perfectionism of one sort or another. Like an internal time capsule the drive for perfection can erupt in various ways in subsequent generations, for example, through artistic, intellectual, business, athletic, social, or religious pursuits. It will be interesting to see how this concrete legacy works itself out in time.

It is possible to learn as much, if not more, from failure as it is from success. Therefore, I would like to turn now to a different sort of evaluation of contemporary lessons of The Oneida Community. From the perspective of philosophy failure can occur in two ways: either the principles themselves can be faulty or the principles may be sound but in practice the principles may be betrayed. In both cases a contradiction is created which can be called the «boomerang effect»; the community ends up being hit from behind by its own principles or practices.¹³ I would like to suggest tentatively the hypothesis that the following four principles of The Oneida Community led to the «boomerang effect»: perfectionism, Bible Communism, complex marriage, and the perceived relation of Heaven and earth. The common thread to all of these so called eventual failures of the utopian society is a fundamental misconception of human nature. Each principle will now be examined in turn with the goal being to determine how new efforts and communitarian life might carry forward the positive aspects of the Oneida experience without «being hit in the end from behind.»

John Humphrey Noyes articulated the principle of perfection as he had discovered it on February 20, 1834. Noyes declared that he had been made perfect because he was saved by Christ from sin. Explaining this further he said: «I do not pretend to perfection in externals. I only claim purity of heart.»¹⁴ The problem with Noyes' principle here is that it is precisely in the heart that the battle for purity of intention takes place. This inner realm is the most resistant to reformation. The mistaken belief that the heart was purified once and for all at the moment of accepting Christ as one's personal saviour led to the situation precisely in which the residue impurities of the heart would eventually create the boomerang effect. The grace flowing from a personal acceptance of Christ may help in the purifying process of both external acts and internal motives of the heart; it does not, however, change human nature to such an extent that the heart is purified permanently. The principle of perfection, as Noyes articulated it, then is based on an erroneous understanding of the relation between grace and human nature.

An example may help to indicate how this principle backfired on Noyes. The discovery and use of a method of mutual criticism was one of the brilliant practical insights of The Oneida Community. In a booklet explaining this practice we are told: «Mutual criticism discovers character by observation of actual conduct.»¹⁵ Another way of describing this is to say: The act reveals the person. Noyes had found the practice of mutual criticism so effective that he hoped it would become a model for all society. The booklet stated: «Every club organized for mutual acquaintance and improvement should adopt Mutual Criticism as its first ordinance.»¹⁶ The

irony of this fact becomes evident when we discover that it was not long before Noyes exempted himself from this practice saying that «in his case criticism became a farce.»¹⁷ Noyes had reached the conclusion that he no longer needed «faithful, honest and sharp criticism», presumably because of a mistaken view of his own degree of perfection both in his heart and in his actions.¹⁸ Perhaps he recognized this failure, even though it was too late, for after the break-up of the Community he finally asked Myron Kinsley to give him another criticism.¹⁹

The second principle I would like to examine is that of Bible Communism as expressed in a statement signed in 1846 by the members of the Putney Community:

All individual proprietorship either of persons or things is surrendered, and absolute community of interests takes the place of the laws and fashions which preside over property and family relations in the world.²⁰

This principle implies that the community, rather than the individual, owns all persons and things within it. However, a person is a subject and as such cannot be owned; only material objects properly speaking are able to be owned. To view a person as a property to be owned either by an individual or a collective is to reduce the person to the status of an object to be used. Once again, the use of two examples may help to show the difficulty.

In the first example, we find Noyes describing the way in which a person, in this case a woman, should be understood as a means to a further end rather than as an end in herself. «You say you love a particular woman . . . but . . . she is only a medium What we love in the particular tune, is music, and what we love in the particular woman, is love»²¹ In a communal ownership of persons the individual inadvertently

becomes reduced to a medium to be used rather than cherished as a person to be loved for himself or herself.

In the second example, we find persons outside of the Community rather than from inside being used as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves. In 1863 the Community decided to hire outside help to perform menial tasks such as the laundry or care of the animals, so that its own members might be freed to do «more important work».²² Within a utopian community the use of hired labor to do tasks that no one wants to do generates a contradiction in values, even though it follows consistently from the practice of using people as a means to a higher end. Significantly, Dr. Theodore Noyes, the socialist son of John Humphrey Noyes, proposed in 1877: «To dismiss as many as possible of the hired help, . . . (thereby) perfecting the organization.»²³ In both of the examples cited, then, the use of persons as a means rather than as an end in themselves, undermines the concept of person as a spiritual subject created in the image of God and of a utopian religious community as a living union of persons.

If Noyes' principle of Bible Communism had been limited to material goods and practices without including persons, it could serve as a positive principle for communitarian life. Religious communities have for centuries owned their material goods in common. Today, the drive for collective ownership of means of production in small industries is being heralded as an important way to maintain and develop the inherent dignity of workers as persons. Therefore one-half of the principle of Bible Communism is still valuable today; things but not persons may be owned in common.

The next principle I would like to evaluate is that of the spousal

dimension of complex marriage itself. The belief in a spousal covenant between God and his people reaches back to the book of Hosea in the Hebrew testament. Noyes believed that within this tradition Christians were called into a spousal covenant. In his Home Talks Noyes stated: «We choose God for our husband,» and «I love the liberty . . . to be married to Christ.»²⁴ It is this particularly Western experience of the religious call as a call into marriage that remains as a constant source of fertility for communal Christian life.

Noyes chose to take the spousal call one step further in his interpretation of the way in which this spousal call ought to be expressed:

The Godhead itself is a marriage duality, . . . the distinction of male and female is in the life that never had a beginning, . . . the manifestation which we see throughout the living universe of sexual love, is a manifestation of what is in the cause of all things.²⁵

The spousal bond, he believed, was best expressed through the exchange of amative love energies in sexual intercourse.²⁶ Drawing upon an analogy from business experience he argued for the complex marriage of all women to all men in the Community:

People assume that (marriage) is to be done in pairs. I consider this as unwise as it would be to say that all the business in New York City must done in firms of two.²⁷

Noyes had discovered the principle of a nuclear reaction in his system of complex marriage. The extraordinary sexual energy which this dynamic social system released had to be held in a container in order to keep it from degenerating into self interested and licentious free love. The container which Noyes discovered was composed of two restraining principles: the

exclusion of horizontal fellowship and the exclusion of particular love. Ironically, it is precisely these two restrictive principles which eventually led to a boomerang effect, especially in the youth of the Community.

The principle of exclusion of horizontal fellowship followed from the practice of ascending and descending fellowship in which intercourse was initiated by a superior person in relation to an inferior.²⁸ Practically speaking, this joined older men with younger women and older women with younger men. In addition, Noyes believed: «In the fellowship between woman and man, man is naturally the superior.»²⁹ Practically speaking again, this meant that the man initiated all sexual encounters. It is not surprising that in the final years of the Community we learn: «young women especially disliked it,» and «The young people do just as they like.»³⁰ In youth, the natural preference for horizontal fellowship rebelled against the restraining principle of ascending and descending fellowship, the container for controlling the sexual energies of the Community erupted, and private interests dominated sexual relations once again.

The second principle of restraint also had a boomerang effect. Community members struggled to overcome romantic and particular attachments. Jessie Kinsley pondered the success of this restraint in her later years: «Since it is true that at the time of the break-up we communists seem to grow suddenly selfish in many ways, I wonder if there was not an afflatus (or spiritual infusion), renewed through criticism . . . that made us go beyond our . . . natural selves -- and took from us the desire for selfish rights.»³¹ During community days people who gave evidence of particular

love were severely criticized and separated from one another. Particular love between mothers and children had similar results.³² Even further, particular attachment between children and their dolls was dealt with in the same way, the dolls were burned and banished from the Community.³³

In the early years of the Community these restraints appeared to work very well to discipline and contain the sexual energy released through the practice of complex marriage. However, as time progressed, the principle of the exclusion of particular love became less effective. Noyes himself described the failure of the opposite goal of communal love by 1877 when he said: «As it is now the community is divided up into cliques that have but little to do with each other.»³⁴ People appeared to be driven deeper and deeper towards particular affections and the support groups of cliques. From the perspective of contemporary psychology, it would seem that intense and mature relationships of particular love are an absolute precondition for the possibility of the transcendence of particularity into a more general love in later life. When particular love is rooted out in all its forms, and especially in children, the inevitable result will be the production of adults who are capable of neither particular nor communal love. In this way, the restraint against particular love would inevitably boomerang and undermine the foundation of the community itself.

The last area with the boomerang effect that I would like to examine concerns the way in which the Community perceived the relation of Heaven and earth. The members of the Community believed that Christ had come to the earth for the second time in 70 AD and that the Holy Spirit had effected a universal baptism for all time at Pentacost.³⁵ As a consequence, the

community believed that by «annexing itself» to the primitive Church it would become the vanguard of a new Heaven on Earth. The Kingdom of Heaven would be built in a two phased process: the first was the gathering of people who had died together with Christ in Heaven beginning in 70 AD and the second was the beginning of the millennium where an actual building of Heaven on earth would start in the United States in the 19th century. Accordingly, the early members of the Community in Putney, Vermont made a public declaration that «The Kingdom of Heaven has Come.» Noyes claimed that this declaration «bore the same relation to the Oneida Community as the Declaration of Independence did to the United States.»³⁶

The belief that Heaven is already here on earth led the early members of the Community to expect the progressive overcoming of disease and even death.³⁷ In addition it released the creative energies which brought about a transformation of human life. Noyes stated: «It is the special function of the present church . . . to break up the worldly social system and establish true sexual and industrial relations.»³⁸ While this principle served the early members of the Community well in activating them towards reform, as time progressed it became less and less central. Indeed, in the later years of community life, secular values began to dominate religious values and many members began to be interested in social reform and utopian life more from a rational than a religious foundation. Two examples will indicate this trend.

Firstly, the names of the journals which the Community published reveal a slowly changing focus: The Witness (1837-1843), The Perfectionist (1843-1846), The Spiritual Magazine (1846-1850), The Free Church Circular

(1850-1851), The Circular (1852-1875) and The American Socialist (1876-1879). From a perspective of Christian witness to one of secular socialism, the written communication from the utopian community indicated a shift from a concern with establishing a Kingdom of Heaven on earth to simply a concern with earth alone.

Secondly, a radical shift occurred in the practices of the Community itself in which rational principles were introduced which rejected a central position which Noyes, as a religious leader had given to freedom of will.³⁹ Ironically, many members of the Community in its last years turned back towards the rational view of man which Robert Owen of the New Harmony Society had originally proposed. Jessie Kinsley described the situation as follows:

In 1877, when Mr. Noyes finally gave his leadership to his son, these two young people, Theodore and Ann, came into remarkable prominence. Full of new ideas . . . they led our quiet communities a strange life Methods of control of intricate Community relationships, without the old appeal to conscience, but by a tabulating card-index sort of system, were tried with policing and espionage.⁴⁰

It is not surprising then, that by 1880 a commission to study the future of the Community reported: «We have no religious unity, which is the cornerstone of communistic success.»⁴¹

We must ask the question: Where had the religious unity gone? What had happened to the conviction of the early members that they were called to establish the Kingdom of Heaven on earth? Perhaps a clue to the answer to this question lies once again in the boomerang effect of the belief that Heaven is already here on earth. For this belief led Noyes to avoid all communal acts of worship. Since Heaven was here there was no

for sacraments of baptism, marriage, confirmation, or the celebration of the eucharist. There was no need for public symbols which join people together.

Noyes declared, after his conversion to perfectionism in 1834: «I found myself constrained (by the Spirit) to refuse going through the usual vocal ceremonies both in private circles and in public meetings.»⁴²

Consequently, Noyes recommended that prayer take place privately in one's own room, or even more privately, while one is lying down in bed.⁴³ This practice of the privatization of prayer did not allow the community to renew itself as a community through communal worship.

In the beginning of the Community, Bible reading served as a communal focal point in public meetings.⁴⁴ However, as time progressed, even this practice lost its effectiveness in bonding a people. For example, in 1867 a revival of Bible study was led by a member of the Community. However, «Mr. Noyes became convinced that the revival was being conducted in a disorganizing spirit . . . Bible classes were obediently though rather reluctantly dropped.»⁴⁵ Even the children resented Bible classes; Pierrepont Noyes refers to them as the «darkest spots in our daily routine.»⁴⁶ Consequently, there was no longer any public and collective way in which the religious consciousness of the Community could renew itself. It was inevitable that a secular and rationalist model of human life would emerge. Therefore, the boomerang effect occurred precisely because the belief that Heaven was already here created a context in which the Community lost the ritual importance of collective worship which is necessary for continuity in a vibrant community of believers while still on earth.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the positive contributions of The Oneida Community for today. The dynamic fusion of contemplation and action, a love of the world as fundamentally good, the release of a love of learning, or technology, and the inventiveness of the human spirit, the commitment to Christian values in the marketplace, a recognition of the complementarity of faith and reason, an openness to the grace of God, and an acceptance of the spousal call to all women and men of good will to rebuild the earth -- these characteristics need to be present to any effective communitarian experiment today. That such experiments will continue to happen is a tribute to the interaction of humanity and God. If I may, I would like to close with a quotation from the founder of The Oneida Community, which expresses this creative dynamic so well:

If you start from the idea that there is a living God at the foundation of all things, then uniformity will be out of the course of nature If the living God is the foundation, then look out for novelties, for his is a mighty force and full of originality.⁴⁷

Sister Prudence Allen, R.S.N.
Department of Philosophy
Concordia University
4 May, 1984

FOOTNOTES

1. This description was made by Hope Emily Allen, a direct descendent of The Oneida Community in her personal correspondence with George Bernard Shaw. Shaw responded: «I agree with you that only a symposium could do justice to the Oneida Creek Community's history; but the difficulty seems to be that the witnesses wont sympose.» Unpublished letters in Syracuse University Archives, dated 19-22 November, 1924.
2. I am particularly grateful to Michael Lacey for originally suggesting a study of The Oneida Community and to George Seay for taking the initiative to bring the project to completion.
3. George Wallingford Noyes, John Humphrey Noyes: The Putney Community (Oneida, N.Y.; 1931) pp. 152-153.
4. Robert Owen, Discourse on A New System of Society, Delivered in the Hall of Representatives of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Gates and Seaton, 1825) p. 3. See also, «(The new System) forms man into a rational being; and, by removing every cause of dislike and jealousy, prepares the most effectual means to unite him with his fellows, and to combine them in one general system of action for their mutual benefit.», p. 18.
5. Noyes, Op. cit.
6. «The history of the world everywhere reveals the purpose of God going forward This history of the world is vertebrate -- it is a connected, organized system, and the purpose of God is its backbone.» John Humphrey Noyes, Home Talks (Oneida: The Community, 1875) p. 13.
7. See, Constance Noyes Robertson, The Oneida Community An Autobiography. 1851-76 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1970) and The Break-up, 1876-1881 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1972) and Spencer C. Olin, Jr. «Bible Communism and the Origins of Orange County» in California History, pp. 220-233.
8. «We have undertaken to combine the fondness for contemplation that monks and transcendentalists have, with the spirit of enterprise and active business habits that belong to the merchant and engineer. We believe that the two principles can be harmonized in the same character, and work together better than apart -- that the contemplative will find its true scope and fulness in the practical, and the practical its true basis and resources in the contemplative.» John Humphrey Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., pp. 39-40.
9. «From the start we were determined to make the best machine twist in the market Within a year from the time we offered our first lot of Community silk we were known as makers of the best machine twist on the market.» The Quadrangle (1910), Vol. VI, nos. 10-11, p. 5. See also, S. Newhouse, The Trapper's Guide; a manuel of Instructions (Community, N.Y.: Oneida Community, Limited, 1887).

10. «Never sell a poor article as a good one; Never allow a known mistake in quantity, price, or making change go unrectified; and Be truthful in all cases, even if it costs you a trade.» Extracts from 1857 guidelines for agents from the Community Circular, reprinted in «Opening Agent's Meeting Notes», January 1948.
11. George Wallingford Noyes, op. cit., pp. 120-121. See also, «A confederation of contiguous states with custom-house lines around each is sure to be quarrelsome. The only way to prevent smuggling and strife in such a confederation is to abolish custom-house lines from the interior, and collect revenues by one custom-line around the whole.» p. 120.
12. «Instead of dividing the universe into two distinct halves, one good and the other evil, and trying to run from evil by getting out of the bad half into the good, we must turn round and claim the undivided whole as our inheritance, and insist that it is all good This is the good lesson of existence -- to learn the faith of God. This is the philosopher's stone that turns all things into gold.» John Humphrey Noyes, op. cit., pp. 201-202.
13. I am grateful to Fr. Thomas Firestone for the particular expression of this effect.
14. George Wallingford Noyes, Religious Experience of John Humphrey Noyes (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1923), p. 120.
15. Anonymous, Mutual Criticism (Oneida, New York: Office of The American Socialist) p. 28. Reprinted Syracuse University Press, 1975. Introduction, Murray Levine and Barbara Benedict Bunker.
16. Ibid., p. 25.
17. Jessie Catherine Kinsley, A Lasting Spring (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1983) p. 30.
18. Mutual Criticism, op. cit., p. 19.
19. Kinsley, op. cit. For a failure of mutual criticism to change the character of Charles Guiteau, assassin of President Garfield. See, Mutual Criticism, Introduction page xvii, and Robert J. Donovan, The Assassins (New York: Harper and Bro., 1955).
20. John Humphrey Noyes, Home Talks, p. 150. See also, «You say that you love a particular woman; . . . but if you analyze your feelings closely, you will find that you do not love her you love Happiness Is it certain that the woman is even the cause of this delectability of of your heart? I say no; God causes it. She is only the medium.» p. 150. See also, Kinsley, op. cit., p. 40. She says that this was a common saying in the Community.

22. See, Harriet Worden, Old Mansion House Memories (Kenwood, Oneida, N.Y., 1950) pp. 27-29. «In 1863, the Community having become easier in its finances . . . hired help was introduced, as our people were required in various increasing businesses.»; and Pierrepont Noyes, My Father's House: An Oneida Boyhood (New York and Toronto: Rinehard and Company, Inc., 1937), p. 22. «We children were watching the cows being driven along the road to their milking. Behind them I saw a man and a dog and someone told me the man was a 'hired man'. I remember puzzling for a long time over What was a 'hired man'?» See also, p. 179 for a view of how the hired men saw Community children.
23. Robertson, The Break-Up, op. cit., p. 47.
24. John Humphrey Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., pp. 285 and 349. See also, p. 257.
25. Ibid., p. 319.
26. Noyes believed that the amative and reproductive aspects of sexual intercourse could be separated. Men, using the masculine principle of self limitation practiced coitus reservatus while women, living out the feminine principle of passivity and enjoyment were encouraged to achieve sexual climax. See, Lorry Foster, Religion and Sexuality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). It is interesting that Noyes got this birth control method from Robert Owen, p. 93. Spiritual Magazine, Vol. II, December 1, 1849, no. 21, p. 621. «All things are distributed into male and female, that is, active and receptive forms of existence.»
27. Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., pp. 351-352.
28. Ibid., pp. 203-205. «We understand by the ascending fellowship, a state in which a person's companionship is with those who are above him in spiritual life, so that the drawing of the fellowship is upward, and by the descending fellowship, a state in which a person loves those who are below him in spiritual life, so that the drawing of the fellowship is downward. . . . All true, legitimate descending fellowship carries with it the inspiration of the superior. This is pretty stringent doctrine, but it is as fair for one as for another. This is the principle which shall take the place of all law.»
29. Ibid., p. 205.
30. Anita McGee in Louis Kern, An Ordered Love (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1981) p. 245 and Robertson, The Break-Up, op. cit., p. 47.
31. Kinsley, op. cit., p. 31.

32. Pierrepont Noyes, op. cit., p. 66. «I often wept bitterly when the time came to return to the Children's House. I remember my mother's terror lest my crying be heard. She knew that Father Noyes frowned on any excess of parental affection as she did on all forms of special love, and she feared that such demonstrations might deprive her of some of my regular visits.» See also, Kinsley, op. cit., p. 24.
33. Wordon, op. cit., p. 80. «Like all little girls, we thought a great deal of our dolls . . . The result was that the public voice condemned the dolls. . . . Mrs. Cragin . . . soon convinced us that it would be the very best thing in the world to join with the grown folks in voting dolls out of the Community forever. And suiting our actions to our words . . . we threw our dolls into the angry looking flames (or the stove). From that time to the present (over twenty years) dolls have never been brought into our nursery.»
34. Robertson, The Break-Up, op. cit., p. 47.
35. Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., pp. 224-229. «I am satisfied that the baptism of the Holy Spirit which was given after Christ's death, commencing from Pentacost, was a baptism not merely of those who were immediately conspicuous in it, but of the whole human race for all time You are all baptised with the Holy Spirit, whether you know it or not and whether you will it or not. It is a universal fact.»
36. George Wallingford Noyes, John Humphrey Noyes: The Putney Community, op. cit., pp. 235-238. «We believe that the kingdom now coming is the same that was established in heaven at the second coming of Christ. God then commenced a kingdom in human nature independent of the laws of this world. That kingdom withdrawn to heaven, has been strengthening and enlarging itself ever since. We look for its reestablishment here, and this extension of an existing government into this world is what we mean by the coming of the Kingdom of God.»
37. George Wallingford Noyes, John Humphrey Noyes: The Putney Community, op. cit., p. 119. «An excerpt from Bible Communism states: 'The Kingdom of God on earth is destined to abolish death'.»
38. Ibid.
39. Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., p. 118. «We must not think of suppressing it (the will), but endeavor to always surround it with such attractions that in the perfection and even delirium of its liberty it will act right.»
40. Kinsley, op. cit., p. 40.

41. Robertson, The Break-Up, op. cit., p. 48. The quotation continues:
«The Community was founded on a belief in Mr. Noyes's practical inspiration. Now, not more than one-half the people believe that. The others have lost their confidence in him to a degree that destroys his control of affairs.»
42. George Wallingford Noyes, Religious Experience of John Humphrey Noyes, op. cit., p. 121.
43. Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., pp. 233-237. «I should recommend this as a form of a true life: Lie down if necessary twenty times a day, and when you find out what there is to do, do it swiftly and with all your might. This is my principle of conservation of force.» «I think I have discovered the true physical method for going this thing; and my closet, according to my personal habits and after some reflection according to my best judgement, is by bed. My impression is that when one wants to give himself up reflection without formality the best way is to go and lie down.»
44. Ibid., p. 285. «Wherever the Bible has gone the Holy Spirit has gone, and wherever the Holy Spirit has gone the Bible has gone.»
45. Robertson, The Break-Up, op. cit., p. 47.
46. Pierrepont Noyes, op. cit., p. 104.
47. Noyes, Home Talks, op. cit., p. 249.